

REMARKS

Claims 7-10 and 19-23 are pending in the present application.
Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Claim Rejections

Claims 7-10 and 19-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,367,009 to Davis et al. (Davis) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,058,426 to Godwin et al. (Godwin). The Applicant traverses this rejection and respectfully asserts that Davis and Godwin do not satisfy a prima facie case of obviousness because all of the claimed limitations are not disclosed, taught or suggested by the references or rendered obvious by market forces present at the time the claimed invention was made.

With specific regard to claims 7, Davis does not provide for a plurality of machines **pre-authorized to access** a web server as claimed. Rather, Davis discloses a client, which "sends its own client certificate to the MTS", wherein the middle tier server (MTS) "authenticates the client". Col. 11:29-43. Thus, the client in Davis is not pre-authorized to access the MTS because Davis requires an authentication process between the client and the MTS.

The Examiner acknowledges that Davis fails to disclose all of the claimed limitations and cites Godwin for the alleged teaching of a requester assuming the identity of a pre-authorized machine. Applicants point out, however, that Godwin also does not disclose a pre-authorized machine as claimed. Rather, Godwin merely describes a central registration tool that employs rule based methods for managing, requesting and obtaining access to resources. In Godwin, upon receiving a request for an application on an external source, a task manager checks rules to determine if prior approval is needed before processing the request (col. 2, lines 32-41, col. 9, lines 23-31, col. 9, lines 38-58, Fig. 5). External requests requiring approval are placed in a service queue with a pending status

(col. 10, lines 21-23), wherein an approver can approve or reject the requests in the queue (col. 9, line 59).

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 7 is patentable over Davis and Godwin. Claims 8-10 depend from claim 7 and therefore also recite patentable subject matter.

With specific regard to claims 19 and 21, Davis does not provide for a network element that is **preauthorized to access** a network resource, as already discussed. For at least the foregoing reason claim 19 and 21 define over Davis and Godwin. Claims 20, and 22-23 depend from claims 19 and 21, therefore also recite patentable subject matter. Accordingly, the Applicant requests the examiner withdraw the instant rejections.

CONCLUSION


Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to pass this case to issue at the Examiner's earliest possible convenience.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (202) 220-4226.

Applicant does not believe that any additional fees are required in connection with this submission. Nonetheless, Applicant authorizes payment of any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 or credit of any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 10, 2007


Robert L. Hails, Jr.
Registration No. 39,702

KENYON & KENYON LLP
1500 K Street, N.W. - Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: (202) 220-4200
Fax: (202) 220-4201